

**Washington State Department of Ecology
SWAC Subcommittee Meeting
E-Waste Project - Meeting #1
October 29, 2004**

Final Notes

On Friday, October 29, 2004 Agreement Dynamics, Inc. facilitated the first of four meetings on the Washington State Department of Ecology E-Waste Project.

SWAC Subcommittee Members Present: Nancy Atwood, AeA, Washington Council; Vicki Austin, Washington Refuse and Recycling Association; Jan Gee, Washington Retail Association; Eric Hulscher, Tacoma Goodwill; Sego Jackson, Snohomish County Solid Waste Management Dept.; Craig Lorch, Total Reclaim; Suellen Mele, Washington Citizens for Resource Conservation; Grant Nelson, Association of Washington Business; Jay Shepard, Washington Dept. of Ecology; Bill Smith, City of Tacoma Solid Waste; Cullen Stephenson, Washington Dept. of Ecology; Frank Warnke, Advocates, Inc. Also present were members of the Agreement Dynamics' facilitation team: Dee Endelman, facilitator; Mary Cabaniss, note taker; Ginny Ratliff, project manager. Subcommittee members Dennis Durbin (Stevens County Public Works) and Mo McBroom (WashPIRG) were absent.

Attachment 1 to these notes is a list of all participants, including audience members, many of whom are members of the project's Technical Team.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Cullen Stephenson welcomed the group on behalf of the Department of Ecology (Ecology). He reviewed the goal of this project: to determine how we can be more effective at conserving our resources and to find solutions to the electronic waste situation, taking into account the interests represented by the Subcommittee members. He noted that Ecology will submit two reports to the State Legislature during the course of this project. The first will be an interim report, submitted by the end of December 2004. The second report, to be submitted by the end of December 2005, will provide an evaluation of alternatives and recommendations.

Cullen then introduced Dee Endelman as the project meeting facilitator. Dee introduced the two other members of the consulting team, Mary Cabaniss and Ginny Ratliff. The SWAC subcommittee and stakeholders then introduced themselves and the organization/stakeholder group with which they are affiliated.

Dee reviewed the purpose, desired outcomes and agenda for Meeting # 1 (Attachment 2). After getting agreement from the Subcommittee with respect to the agenda, she reviewed suggested meeting guidelines (Attachment 3).

SETTING UP THE PROJECT: PURPOSE, ROLES AND GROUND RULES

Jay Shepard then reviewed the background and purpose of the project with a Power Point presentation on legislative bill ESHB 2488 (Attachment 4).

ESHB 2488 requires the Department of Ecology to conduct research and develop recommendations for implementing and financing an electronic product collection, recycling and reuse program. The legislative report outline is divided into three sections, with questions to address in each section. The three sections with pertinent questions for each are:

1. Background & analysis

“What are electronic wastes and why are they a problem?”

Review of the problem

Review of projects and programs

2. Evaluation

“What programs and projects are the best models?”

3. Recommendations

“What are the best options to establish and finance a statewide collection, reuse, and recycling program for covered electronic products?”

The law requires that Ecology consult with a diverse group of stakeholders, as represented by the Subcommittee members. Ecology hopes to address the legislative requirements in four meetings. The topics for the four meetings are:

Meeting #1: Review of the problem

Meeting #2: Review of projects and programs

Meeting #3: Evaluation of projects and programs effectiveness in addressing the problems

Meeting #4: Discussion and development of recommendations.

Subcommittee members asked Jay to address how Ecology would respond if there were no consensus recommendations from the Subcommittee. Jay indicated that Ecology would report on options with pros and cons and that Ecology would recommend options based on their environmental, financial, social, political, and economic implications. The Subcommittee also began a brief discussion of the scope of the recommendations with respect to whether only consumer electronics for personal use are covered or if consumer electronics from other generators (such as agencies and businesses) are to be covered to address portions of the legislation.

The facilitator then reviewed the roles of the participants:

- Ecology is responsible to develop recommendations to the legislature. Ecology representatives will sit at the table with the Subcommittee but will not participate in giving their opinions. Rather, they will listen to all participants' ideas, ask questions, and provide technical information and support.
- The facilitator is a neutral party and will keep the discussion moving forward. The facilitation team will also write meeting notes to be reviewed by both Ecology and Subcommittee members for accuracy. The facilitation team is also responsible for working with Ecology to draft reports to the legislature.
- The Subcommittee's role is to provide input to Ecology for its recommendations. Subcommittee members will do this by reviewing and discussing information provided by the Technical Team, sharing interests and views, and working on mutually acceptable solutions based on those interests and views.
- The Technical Team's role is to provide research on the issue of electronic waste, including information on the problem, programs designed to address the problem, and the like.

The facilitator noted that the facilitation team had set up two ways for audience members to provide input:

1. Comment sheets: Any participant can complete a "SWAC Subcommittee on E-Waste Comment Card" for any comments or questions for Ecology; and
2. At designated times, as determined by the Subcommittee, the stakeholders will have an opportunity to express their ideas and opinions.

Any questions or comment sheets will be included as an addendum to the Meeting Notes.

Dee then reviewed proposed Draft Group Agreements and procedural ground rules designed to assure a common understanding of how the project would be completed (Attachment 5). Subcommittee members made two changes to the suggested draft:

1. Subcommittee members who cannot attend a meeting can provide a substitute. The group decided that designated alternates who are kept fully informed of the work and issues would be better than sending ad hoc substitutes; and

2. During meetings, unless conversations are designated for Subcommittee members only, audience members may ask questions and make comments as time allows.

Dee will amend and redistribute the agreements.

Dee reviewed with the group the behaviors, skills and methods to hold interest-based discussions. The key to an interest-based approach is to understand the key needs and concerns (interests) of different stakeholders and to seek solutions that respected those interests. (Attachment 6 includes handouts related to behaviors, skills and methods discussed.)

After a break, the group reviewed a draft list of interests of various Subcommittee members, which Dee had compiled following telephone interviews with each (Attachment 7). The group members added and amended their list of interests. Dee will make the changes and publish a revised interests list.

The group discussed the following aspects of the Interests reviewed:

1. They noted that many of the Subcommittee's core interests are complementary. There are more similarities than differences represented among the members;
2. One of the core interests articulated by all Subcommittee members is the desire to implement a financially sustainable e-waste recycling system; and
3. The value in articulating interests, rather than discussing positions, lies in the possibility of finding solutions that respect diverse interests, rather than spending all of our energy arguing over which position is right.

At this point, one participant asked why association representatives, rather than manufacturers themselves, are on the Subcommittee. Jay explained that the Technical Team includes manufacturers who actively contribute their input. However, as association representatives at the table explained, their job is to represent an industry point of view that has balanced the sometimes-differing interests of their various members. The group talked about the need for association representatives to bring ideas from the Subcommittee to their respective clients as this promotes two-way communication and results in more productive contributions to the conversations. Dee also reminded everyone of the Subcommittee's decision to have audience members (some of whom are manufacturers) give input during the course of the meeting.

CRITERIA FOR PROJECT SUCCESS

Each Subcommittee member defined their criteria of success based on the question: "What would make this a successful project?" Following were the responses given:

- Some short-term solutions and policy options while thinking of medium and long-term goals; our short-term solutions may amend our thinking about long-term goals.
- Short-term, viable solutions that the legislature will accept.
- Solutions that will allow Goodwill to continue to be a proponent of re-use
- A solution that leads to a highly successful result for all sectors, is environmentally sound, and promotes job creation.
- A consensus of the definition of the problem with measurements of what constitutes success.
- A solution that is financially viable for all and avoids revisiting the issue with the legislature over and over.
- A short-term solution and a long-term system that includes the collection, transportation, and recycling of all e-waste and provides an incentive for manufacturers to design products that are cleaner.
- A system that makes it as easy to recycle a computer as it is to buy one.
- A system that influences product design , is environmentally sound and environmentally just.
- An accurate and complete report identifying both the pro's and con's.
- Solutions that create a level playing field for manufacturers and one in which consumers realize their responsibility in buying and disposal decisions.
- Solutions that ensure the viability of an electronic recycling industry and which support the reuse and recovery of materials.
- Responsible response to the legislature and environmentally viable solutions which are responsive to all citizens.
- A Washington State solution that becomes a nationwide e-waste policy
- A solution that allows us to all go downtown and lobby together.

DEFINING THE E-WASTE PROBLEM

Technical Presentation

On behalf of the technical team, Jay Shepard gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the e-waste situation (Attachment 8). The presentation extrapolated, based on available data, the number of consumer electronics (primarily computers and television sets) which are currently in Washington State households and their expected rate of increase. The research showed that the numbers of TV's and computers due to reach end of life over the next 5-7 years

represent a potentially significant e-waste problem. Following are some key points:

- Although there are many categories of electronics which create e-waste, the focus of this project's research is on consumer electronics (primarily computers and television sets).
- Based on extrapolated data, there may be an average of 2.4 televisions in Washington State households. Televisions will increase from 5.6 million in 2003 to 7 million in 2010.
- Based on data from the state of Florida, it appears that television sets have an average life of 14 years. With advances in technology (HDTV, etc.), consumers may purchase sets before their current sets' useful life is over.
- Based on extrapolated data, there may be an average of 3 computers per household in Washington State.
- Using current census information, national data suggest that household computers are steadily increasing. Washington State has a higher number of computers/household than the national average.
- Between 2003-2010, it is anticipated that 1.5 million laptops and approximately 500,000 desk top computers will reach their end of life. This data is from studies of 16,615 tons of electronic waste.
- There are differences in rural and urban electronic use. An annotated state map showed significantly higher numbers of computers/household on the West side of the mountains and between and among counties in both Eastern and Western Washington. In designing a statewide system, the cost effectiveness will vary from county to county.

Following the presentation, Subcommittee members and audience members asked clarifying questions. In addition to the topics noted above, questions were asked in the following areas:

- Exports: Who is collecting? Where is the e-waste being sent? Is it shipped as a product or waste? How do we ensure the condition of the e-waste is in compliance with environmental laws?
- Charity Disposal: What organizations are included when we talk about "charity disposal"?
- Existing Programs: How are curbside E-waste programs in place in Washington already doing? Are there statistics?

Economic Presentation

Dave Reich, an economist with Ecology and a member of the Technical Team, then gave a presentation on the economic issues associated with e-waste (Attachment 9). Dave's presentation framed economics in terms of internal costs (i.e., the "hard" costs associated with various methods of electronic end-of-life options) as well as external costs (i.e., the costs less easy to quantify such as environmental degradation or public safety). Although drawing no conclusions regarding the most overall cost effective end-of-life options, Dave reviewed the areas that the Technical Team still needed to review.

Group Discussion

The group was then asked to comment on what they agreed with in the presentations; what they disagreed with; and what they would like the Technical Team to consider further. Following are some of the comments made by Subcommittee members as well as Technical Team and other audience members:

- There will be revisions to the reports as more information surfaces.
- Data on repair shops should be included with the charities.
- What is the number of pounds per capita that is being deposited at the drop-off programs?
- More information on the recycling market would be helpful.
- There is a large market for residuals. How can this be utilized?
- Look at manufacturer take back programs, such as the recent Office Depot/HP program.
- Look at programs that engage manufacturers in developing the appropriate markets. Panasonic is a good example of a company with strong CRT glass recycling program.
- Let's get a solid understanding on the current situation in Washington State. Is this an immediate and urgent problem?
- What is a good definition of export? Need more quantitative detail and a solid understanding of the legal issues.
- Let's look at the costs of local programs.
- NEPSI has a report on costs. It will be out in December. Let's look at it.
- We need to get more local data. For example, what about manufacturing and retail sales locally? (Sometimes this data is difficult to obtain due to competitive concerns. Jay Shepard is gathering more information in his database, however. There will be a national database available on the electronic programs and the retail programs will be included.)

- Manufacturer requirements impact product-design improvements. Some industries acknowledge that manufacturer participation is an advantage. Television manufacturers do not have an incentive due to the 14-year life span of televisions. If the goal is to design products that are environmentally sound, there could be environmental labels on the product.
- Are there other studies besides Florida?
- With respect to toxicity levels, there is data indicating that American women have high levels of polybrominated diphenyl ether (PBDE). Are we looking at this information?

SWAC Subcommittee members then shared their perspective on defining the e-waste problem;

- City of Tacoma: Cities now have a new waste stream that has to be handled separately from other solid wastes. Hence, it is an immediate and costly problem for local governments which have no resources to handle it effectively.
- Washington Citizens for Resource Conservation: This is a long-term problem. Funds for handling problems at landfills are required for 30 years after closure, but e-waste lasts much longer.. In addition to being an environmental problem, it is a human health problem due to the presence of toxic substances in equipment from its manufacture through use through end of life. It is also a resource issue—we don't want to keep extracting resources when we can be reusing them. Finally, it is an issue about creating safe jobs.
- AWB: Hearing from others that this issue is about human health, mining of resources and government costs. The human health problem may be addressed by means such as increased worker safety. It is important not to overstate the problem.
- Advocates, Inc.: This is a short-term problem since manufacturers will provide their own expertise regarding environmental systems that work economically.
- Goodwill: This is an immediate issue for us. We are losing money and opportunity.
- Snohomish County: Currently, the proper management system for these wastes is creating costs for local government and those providing e-waste recycling options that need to be recouped, such as through fees. There are inherent inefficiencies in our current system. Those actively dealing with the system are not fully recouping costs with fees. The public's perception is that there is a problem, based on their phone calls and demands for solutions, where they have been informed of the issues. This makes it an immediate problem and long-range problem that will grow.

- Retail Association: This is a transitional period where the collection program for these materials is out of sync with the needs. We are on our way to successful solutions. How to pay for the collection is the issue.
- WRRRA: The biggest problem is taking all of these issues into account in producing a good result.
- AEA: The issue is how to handle electronic wastes at end of life. We need to go further to understand the quantity of the problem. We need better data in the assumptions of the scope of the problem, i.e., projections regarding the number of computers per household.
- Total Reclaim: The problem is lack of certainty regarding regulations, processing methods and management of residuals. One of the questions is how to build a solid recycling industry over the long term.
- Consumer education is part of the issue. We all share responsibility for the e-waste problem.

The group began to discuss the laws governing e-waste and how these laws, including international law, would affect the issue in the long run. The Subcommittee asked Ecology to put together a matrix of the laws to help them understand their implications.

COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

Dee asked the Subcommittee to consider how they would communicate information from these meetings to others. The Subcommittee agreed that publishing the notes from the Committee on Ecology's website, along with keeping the interested stakeholders informed, would be sufficient at this time.

Some suggestions were raised on how to respond to the media if the opportunity comes up:

- Know you're not speaking on behalf of the group.
- Don't try to paraphrase or give opinion of the group.
- Be judicious about posting information on the list serve.

Ecology has set up a "Work Room" (secured site) for the Technical Team and another for the Subcommittee members to communicate with each other and post questions. Dee suggested that, if the Subcommittee chooses to use this work room between meetings, all members agree to use the same ground rule on this site as practiced in the meetings.

NEXT STEPS

The Technical Team will begin work on existing projects and programs.

The group agreed on and scheduled the next two meetings, to be held at the Holiday Inn Express on the following dates:

Meeting #2: Sat., March 19: 9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Meeting #3: Tues., May 10: 9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Audience comments are Attachment 10 to these notes.

ACTION ITEMS FROM THIS MEETING

1. Jay will send the Technical Team work plan to the Subcommittee.
2. Jay will include the names of the SWAC Subcommittee members and interested parties on Ecology's website. This list will include e-mail addresses.
3. Dee will revise the "Draft Group Agreements" to reflect the changes under "Participants," to include the use of substitutes and audience participation. Subcommittee members will e-mail Ginny Ratliff the name of their substitutes within the next week.
4. Dee will make changes to the Subcommittee Interests List and re-distribute it.
5. Jay will post the Technical Team PowerPoint presentation on the Ecology Website.
6. Jay will assemble a matrix of laws related to e-waste, including international laws, for Meeting #2.
7. Jay and Lisa will set up a resource section on the web site.
8. ADI will write up notes from this meeting and send them to Ecology within approximately one week of the meeting. Once Jay has reviewed them, ADI will send them out to all Subcommittee members for review. Subcommittee members will give input within one week of receiving notes. They will then be posted on Ecology's Website.

Attachment 1

SWAC Subcommittee E-Waste Meeting Participant Sign-In Sheet Date 10/29/04 Time: 9:00-4:00

1. Nancy	Atwood	American Electronics Association
2. Vicki	Austin	WA Refuse and Recycling Association
3. Mary	Cabaniss	Notetaker, Agreement Dynamics
4. Dan	Coyne	Hewlett-Packard
5. Frank	Dick	Sharp Electronics
6. Kim	Ducote	CCA Consulting for Rabanco Co.
7. Dee	Endelman	Facilitator, Agreement Dynamics
8. Lori	Evans	Evans Capitol Consulting
9. Jan	Gee	WA Retail Association
10. Dave	Godlewski	Teck Cominco American
11. Jerry	Hardebeck	Waste Management
12. Tiffany	Hatch	Seattle Goodwill
13. Eric	Hulscher	Tacoma Goodwill
14. Sego	Jackson	Snohomish County
15. Larry	King	Hewlett-Packard
16. Craig	Lorch	Total Reclaim
17. Suellen	Mele	WA Citizens for Resource Conservation
18. Brian	Miller	Apple Computer
19. Grant	Nelson	Association of Washington Business
20. Jeff	Olsen	WA House of Representatives
21. Angela	Rae	WA State Recycling Association
22. Ginny	Ratliff	Project Manager, Agreement Dynamics
23. Dave	Reich	Ecology
24. Lisa	Sepanski	King Co. Solid Waste
25. Jim	Sheire	Philips
26. Jay	Shepard	Ecology
27. Jerry	Smedes	Smedes and Assoc.
28. Bill	Smith	City of Tacoma Solid Waste Management
29. Gary	Smith	Independent Business Association
30. Cullen	Stephenson	Ecology
31. David	Stitzhal	NWPSC
32. Dale	Swanson	Matsushita Electronics-Panasonic
33. Frank	Warnke	Advocates, Inc.
34. Sarah	Westervelt	Basal Action Network
35. Nancee	Wildermuth	Attorney at Law
36. Jill	Will	Jail Industries Board

Attachment 2**Agenda****Washington State Department of Ecology E-Waste Project
Meeting # 1: October 29, 2004**

Purpose: To talk about how we will carry out this project and to review the current condition of electronic product reuse and recycling in Washington

Desired Outcomes:

- Understanding of project scope and subcommittee's role
- Agreement on procedural ground rules
- Understanding of the interests of each stakeholder group
- Initial discussion of research on reuse and recycling of electronic products
- Action plan for and scheduling of future meetings

Time	Topic
9:00 a.m.	Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome by Ecology• Agenda review and ground rules• Group introductions—subcommittee members and audience• Discussion of feedback and evaluation forms for subcommittee and audience use
9:30 a.m.	Setting Up the Project <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review of project purpose and general timeline• Role of Subcommittee• Draft procedural ground rules for subcommittee discussion and approval
10:30 a.m.	Break
10:40 a.m.	Taking an Interest-Based Approach to these Discussions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review of interest-based problem solving method• Facilitator summary of interests heard while interviewing subcommittee members• Discussion of interests
Noon	Lunch
12:45 p.m.	Criteria for Project Success: What is your picture of a successful project?
1:15 p.m.	Defining the E-waste Problem <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Technical team presentation on e-waste issues
2:00 p.m.	Break
2:10 p.m.	Defining the E-waste Problem (continued) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Questions and answers• Initial discussion of research presented
3:00 p.m.	Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Research to be done• Communicating these meetings to interested people• Agenda for Meeting # 2• Meeting Scheduling• Action items• Meeting evaluation
4:00 p.m.	Adjourn

Attachment 3

Suggested Guidelines for this Meeting

- Audience members are welcomed as observers. Feedback forms have been provided for your ideas and there will some time for questions and comments at designated times.
- SWAC Subcommittee Members will be the primary participants in discussions.
- Use airtime appropriately (don't withhold your opinions but remember to "share the air").
- Speaking honestly and respectfully.
- Don't interrupt a speaker.
- Focus on interests rather than positions.
- Stay on time and on task.
- Other suggested guidelines?

Attachment 4

PowerPoint presentation on Ecology's Website - see "Meeting 1 Documents":
<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/swfa/ewaste/index.html>

Attachment 5

Washington State Department of Ecology E-Waste Project SWAC Subcommittee Group Agreements

Edited based on Subcommittee discussion of October 29, 2004

Goal	To provide consultation to Ecology as the department develops its recommendations to the legislature pursuant to Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2488.
Process	Collaborative, interest-based discussions, hopefully leading to points of agreement.
Participants	SWAC Subcommittee members are to be involved in active discussions as representatives of their constituency. Each Subcommittee member will designate an alternate to be present if the Subcommittee member cannot be and who will be kept current on committee work and issues. Other interested parties attending the meeting may be asked to give their input during some of the discussions, as agreed to by the Subcommittee.
Schedule and Timeline	The group has agreed to meet at least four times between October 2004 and December 2005. There will be a final report to Ecology for purposes of its recommendations no later than December 2005. A status report will be submitted to the legislature in December 2004.
Records	The record of this group will be the official notes taken at these meetings. These notes will be reviewed and approved by the group via e-mail after each meeting.
Communications	Participants will agree on a communications plan and this plan will be used for all communications to interested parties and others not involved in these meetings.
Decision Making	While consensus on advice provided to Ecology is desirable, we recognize the potential of disagreement among Subcommittee members. We agree in this collaborative effort that, if after interest-based discussions, we are unable to reach agreement on some points, Ecology will be provided our various concerns to consider when formulating its recommendations.
Meetings	There will be four one-day meetings to be held in the Seattle-Tacoma area. The Subcommittee may schedule an additional meeting or two, if necessary, complete the work.

Attachment 6

Agreement Dynamics, Inc. copyrighted PDF artwork not included in this file

Attachment 7

Draft: Interests Articulated by Subcommittee Members (As edited based on Subcommittee feedback at 10/29/04 meeting)

What are your organization, member or client needs, interests and concerns regarding solutions to the e-waste issues?

Sego Jackson (Snohomish County Solid Waste Management)

- Finance system that covers collection through processing costs without reliance on government taking over costs/taxing
- Environmentally and financially sustainable system that leads to smart private sector decisions
- Manufacturer responsibility
- Solution that solves environmental problems here without creating them elsewhere
- Easy and convenient collection System

Suellen Mele (Washington Citizens for Resource Conservation)

- No system that creates disincentives to recycling
- Environmentally and financially sustainable system that leads to smart private sector decisions
- Manufacturer responsibility
- System that leads to convenient, effective and responsible recycling
- System that is environmentally just
- Solution that examines financing options for schools, government and small businesses as well as individuals
- System that promoted design for environment

Eric Hulscher (Tacoma Goodwill)

- Solution that enables us to continue accepting electronic items without the liability Goodwill currently has
- System in which we will not lose money when we recycle items we can't sell
- Financially sustainable system

Grant Nelson (Association of Washington Business)

- Decisions based on sound and balanced assessment of facts
- Solution that does not pit one sector of business community against another
- Solutions that keep businesses in Washington competitive in bigger markets
- Solutions that include existing infrastructure

Craig Lorch (Total Reclaim)

- Level playing field for e-waste recyclers: Regulatory certainty regarding exporting materials

- System that supports conservation of natural resources
- Financially sustainable recycling system

Mo McBroom (WashPIRG)

- System that serves the public interest, rather than special interests
- Manufacturer responsibility
- Environmental protection and the prosperity that allows for it
- System that promotes clean design and responsible recycling

Bill Smith (City of Tacoma Solid Waste)

- E-waste should not be an unfunded mandate on Tacoma's rate payers
- Cities reimbursed for costs of collecting and transporting materials
- No competitive disadvantages (level playing field across the State)
- Shared responsibility—manufacturers and consumers

Nancy Atwood (AeA, Washington Council)

- Level playing field that doesn't disadvantage one company against another
- Shared responsibility: manufacturers should participate but not have the system completely on their backs
- National solution so that businesses can operate in Washington State as well as other states
- Decisions based on sound and balanced assessment of the facts

Dennis Durbin (Stevens County Public Works)

- System that is financially viable for businesses
- Program that encourages legal recycling
- No system that requires government to bear the costs of recycling with current resources or forces them to increase fees to cover costs

Frank Warnke (Advocates, Inc., representing a consortium of manufacturers)

- Decisions based on sound and balanced assessment of the facts
- Shared responsibility: one segment of the industry shouldn't have to pay the entire cost
- System that will result in a long-term solution
- Solutions that are financially viable for manufacturers

Vicki Austin (Washington Refuse and Recycling Association)

- Decisions based on sound and balanced assessment of the facts
- System that includes our current infrastructure (both haulers and landfill operators)
- No "one size fits all" solution (rural counties and urban centers require different delivery systems)
- Financially sustainable recycling
- No landfill ban of electronics without another solution

Jan Gee (Washington Retail Association)

- Decisions based on sound and balanced assessment of the facts
- No requirements for retailers to take back and hold products
- No complex, bureaucratic bookkeeping
- Compensation for administrative costs to retailers
- System that educates consumers regarding e-waste
- Solution that does not penalize Washington businesses/brick-and-mortar retailers versus e-commerce

Attachment 8

PowerPoint presentation on Ecology's Website - see "Meeting 1 Documents":
<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/swfa/ewaste/index.html>

Attachment 9

PowerPoint presentation on Ecology's Website - see "Meeting 1 Documents":
<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/swfa/ewaste/index.html>

Attachment 10

This comment card was received at the 10/29/04 meeting.

SWAC Subcommittee on E-Waste Comment Card

Please use this card to jot down any comments or questions you have for Ecology.

Topic: *Vision of Success*

What is your comment/question?

Fair and Equitable shared responsibility among all stakeholders along the recycling continuum; and shared responsibility that is appropriate for each stakeholder; i.e., no one stakeholder bears the burden.

Name:

Angela Rae, WA State Recycling Association

Name/contact information (Optional):

Angela Rae, WA State Recycling Association

At the 10/29/04 E-Waste Meeting, Agreement Dynamics received 10 Meeting Evaluation Forms. The Results are compiled below.

**SWAC Advisory Subcommittee on Electronics Waste
Meeting Evaluation**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Comments
The meeting facilities were adequate.	4	5	1			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>To cold or to hot! Need balance!</i> • <i>More hot water, please.</i>
The facilitator was helpful in keeping the discussions on track.	6	4				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Thank you for helping us end early.</i>
The E-Waste presentations gave me a better understanding of the issues.	3	6		1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Still very unclear on the core problem.</i>
Opportunities for Q&A and feedback to the SWAC Subcommittee were adequate.	5	4		1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Build public input into agenda</i>
Suggestions for improvement:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Great job!</i> • <i>Great Location. Convenient. Parking very good.</i> • <i>Handout with slides needs to be more readable. Having "Interest" document ahead of time would have been useful.</i> • <i>Microphones for subcommittee, more structured input time for guests.</i> • <i>Cookies at lunch OK. PM break is OK too.</i> • <i>Lunch was good- Thanks! Good work on the meeting.</i> 					